

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

## Preliminary Minutes for the February 14, 2011 Meeting

**Chairman: Oliver Smith; Vice Chairman: Anne Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison**

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N= Nay  
P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 4 March 2011

Approved: 14 March 2011

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #: 07:00**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	C L O U T I E R	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 14

Yes ( x)

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**2. Approval of Minutes: January 31, 2011**

**Motion:** The VCCPG approves the January 31, 2011 minutes as Corrected

Maker/Second: Lewis/Glavinic

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A):** voice 14-0-0

Notes:

**3. Open Forum:**

- a) The Department of Planning and Land Use sent VCCPG information regarding an initial meeting with the proponents of the Accretive project. Chairman Smith indicated he would add the formation of a project sub-committee to the agenda for March. Rudolf suggested it was inappropriate to form such a committee until substantive proposals/plans were available to review.

**4. Announcements & Items of Public Interest for Discussion:**

- a) **Discussion and report on the Board of Supervisors meeting on the General Plan Update on February 9, 2011. (Smith)**  
Smith reported no new decisions were made by BOS. Glavinic reported that BOS listed a number of issues for review at their next meeting including ground water impacts and economic impacts.

- b) **Report and Discussion of the Mobility Subcommittee meeting on January 24, 2011 to discuss ideas for using the funds available for Valley Center Road improvements. (Davis)**  
The meeting was quite successful, with significant public participation. A comprehensive list of proposed projects was forwarded to the County for evaluation and cost analysis. At a subsequent meeting, the sub-committee will review feedback from the County with the public to reconsider and prioritize projects within the limits of available funding.

- c) **Discussion of the pros and cons of wind turbine use in Valley Center (Davis)**  
Davis pointed out that the technical documentation for the two systems proposed for Valley Center is available online. The principal issues are placement, noise, and safety. San Diego County updated its wind generation ordinance on 9-11-2010 and it represents a thoughtful development process. The manufacturer of the two systems proposed for Valley Center has been very helpful with test results and documentation.

	<p>Davis reported that the small turbines appear to be very quiet. Another issue in rural areas is animal strikes [birds principally]. So far, there has been no analysis of bird strikes in relation to failure of the proposed systems or impacts on animal populations. Residential turbines operate at higher speeds [500-1000 rpm] that could affect the hazard to wildlife and domestic animals [cats on roof]. Davis suggested a serious concern was disintegration of the turbine during failure, and how far debris might be flung? Another issue could be harmonics caused by adjacent turbines. However there is no information, presently, on what, if any, affects this might cause.</p> <p>SD County wants to encourage turbines as useful alternative energy sources. Rudolf asked about what findings would be required, and the structure of administrative permits for small, medium, and large systems. Small systems are still undefined. Medium systems' turbines sweep up to 850 square feet. Smith offered information on large systems sent to him from Boulevard. Several photos of fires and loss of blades were presented showing the potential for failure of large systems. Two major considerations for large systems are setbacks and ground vibrations. The setback distance [distance from turbine to property line] is three times the height of the turbine.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Action Items:</b>
<b>5.a.</b>	P10-010; Lilac Ridge Verizon Wireless project, 10378 Lavender Point, Escondido, CA; Site Plan with Enlarged Storm Water Management Plan, elevations and other detailed drawings. (Anderson)
<b>Note:</b> This item is continued until March 2011.	
<b>5.b.</b>	MUP10-001; APN 129-170-07; new Verizon Wireless telecommunication site; 30641 Rolling Hills Drive off of Old Castle Road. Applicant is Verizon wireless, contact is Eric Neilson Owners are Nora and Marty Marvin 30641 Rolling Hills Drive 760-855-3107. No DPLU contact is provided. (Anderson)
<b>Note:</b> Continuing from four months ago. The project has switched from a monopole pine to monopole broadleaf tower as requested. This item is continued until March 2011	
<b>5.c.</b>	<b>Administrative permits AD10-059 (30882 Palomar Vista Dr) and AD10-060 (30893 Palomar Vista Dr) for wind turbines proposed for Valley Center residential installation. (Bachman)</b>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed turbine systems are intended for two properties located east of the high school. Each property owner proposes 5 turbines, each with a five-foot diameter swept area. Each applicant signed a noise compliance agreement intended to protect neighbors from excessive noise. Setbacks are 50-80 ft from neighbors. The entire fan of each turbine will be above the peak of the roofline. An example of a similar system in Lakeside was visible but not disturbing according to Bachman.</p> <p>Rick Berry and James Kay represented San Diego Small Wind, system installer. The rooftop turbine equipment weighs about 60 lb per unit, and each unit delivers 1.8 kilowatts of electricity. Engineering tests on the units have been extensive. However, not as much safety data exists on small residential systems, most data are from large commercial systems. Apparently, blade ejection has been mitigated in the proposed systems. Noise is the major concern. Ambient noise is typically three times louder than that generated by the proposed product. At two feet from the turbine, sensors measured 28 decibels. Four units generate about 50 decibels at five feet from turbines. The SD County noise ordinance permits 50 decibels during daylight hours at the property line. Noise reports have been assembled by Iler Associates. Berry and Kay suggested that the noise compliance agreement is sufficient to protect neighbors. Twelve more systems will be proposed for Valley Center. The county is satisfied with the noise generation profile of the proposed systems.</p> <p>Hofler questioned whether the units might create sonic interference for bats at the generated frequencies. No data are apparently available. 500-1000 Hz is typical for proposed systems. Rudolf inserted that noise ordinance findings include setback three times the height from ground to top of blade. Berry claims setback</p>	

is 60ft on each side and height may not exceed 35ft. On both houses proposed blade height is 23 ft. Comprehensive testing with varying wind loads has been conducted and they meet County standards. Glavinic asked about wind velocity minimum. System works at 10-11mph and efficiently at 15-18mph. Brakes are included on blades, and switches are also located on inverters. Blade design causes stall in excessive winds to prevent self-destruction. Storage of electricity is done on the grid, not batteries. There is no history of bird strikes, which is a bigger problem for large systems [re predatory birds]. Norwood-Johnson asked about distance from High School - 0.75mi. Bachman asked about plot plan – not available. Asked about rpm of operation - no technical response. What about safety shroud? Self-defeating for wind turbine. Two systems in China survived typhoon. Systems are tested at 105mph and will stall by design. Maintenance contract? San Diego Small Wind [installer] services and warrants for five years. Davis says blades are not visible at 800-1000 rpm. Berry responds with info on renewable energy. Applicant parcel size is two acres; requirement is 1 acre. System grandfathering policy is not clear if requirements change. Vick asks, re five-turbine system [\$18K], how do you predict output for buyers? Berry replies that some history suggests a savings of 30-35% on utility bill with two turbines. Anneliese Schneider, nearest neighbor to proposed systems, says setback is not 60 ft from her property. Bachman suggests that it is 30 ft to property line and additional 35 ft to first unit on roof. Schneider was told there were no similar examples in San Diego, but found some in San Marcos and San Diego. She claims the noise is greater than represented by Berry and Kay. She is concerned about noise. She says a tested four-unit system produced 45 Decibels for night operation, but she will have five units next to her. Aesthetics are also an issue. She wants to see an example to assuage her concerns. Glavinic disapproves of the noise from these systems for Valley Center, suggesting the noise is cumulative. Melissa Johnson suggests noise agreements protect neighbors; applicants will have to disassemble systems if they violate agreement.

**Motion:** Continue this item until we have final plot plans.

**Maker/Second:** Bachman/Vick

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 8-6-0**

A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	C L O U T I E R	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y

**5.d.**

2200-10-041; AT&T Mobility East Lilac Wireless Telecom Facility; 30352 Circle R Lane and Circle R Drive. Applicant is ATT Mobility at 760-751-3416. (DPLU Planner is Michelle Chan) (Glavinic)

**Discussion:** Valley Center has many geographical pockets with no cell phone service. This is one area. Line of sight is required for effective wireless use. The proposed site is ¼ mi. from previously approved Verizon site that will have a 45 ft. tower. The proposed site is reasonably distant from neighbors. A neighbor objects to the proposed tower [probably aesthetic concerns]. ATT is asking for a 45ft tower at its site. County has asked to collocate Verizon and ATT antennas. Verizon site is nearer to a home but not close. Ted Marcelli, representing ATT says their engineers rejected the Verizon site. ATT is trying for greater westward coverage than Verizon site will provide. May not be able to collocate on Verizon's tower, might have to go 10-15ft higher to get desired coverage. Either site can work. Moving to Verizon's site would cause delay in construction. Height waiver for ATT is possible to make Verizon tower work. ATT proposed site may be better for coverage of Circle R Road. Davis doesn't see advantage to forcing collocation. Also, new technology may be better served by ATT site in future.

**Motion:** Approve ATT request

**Maker/Second:** Glavinic/Quinley

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 Voice**

**5.e.**

3200-201183, TPM21183 Kim Tentative Parcel Map located at 29770 Pamoosa Lane and Old Castle Road. Project is a minor Subdivision. The existing 46.92 acre parcel will be split into four lots plus a remainder parcel. Four building pads for future residential development are proposed. (DPLU Planner is Katie Hughes) (Britsch)

**Discussion:** Project is a five-parcel subdivision in Moosa Canyon. There are several issues including

location in a flood plain and new GPU considerations [may go to 1du /20a]; wetlands/wildlife corridors running through property [issue particularly for lot 4]; percolation tests problematic because of lack of rain [?]; fire access will require rework. The County is concerned also about cultural issues. There was a 2008 citation for poor culvert design. The culvert was destroyed in recent rains and is being rebuilt. Another issue is existing buildings with septic systems that must be addressed. Mr. Wong, engineer, representing applicant, believes County will approve septic plan. Not trying to get approval before new GP. Intend to sell lots to finance house [maybe on lot 3]. Applicant will address fire access issues, and, will redesign lot 4 which may result in fewer lots. Smith questions realignment of parcel boundaries for fire access. Terry Lien, neighbor, notes that emergency vehicles need turnaround space and additional brush removal is necessary. Melissa Johnson, neighbor, also spoke to road conditions and stewardship of land and sympathy for Kim's planned subdivision. Glavinic addressed Moosa Creek crossings and danger of flooding as well as fire access. Applicant will be doing additional biological studies per county. Rudolf suggests there could be problems in relation to GP and new GPU requirements.

**Motion:** Recommend neither approval nor rejection of the project at this time. We would like to review this project once the major issues listed in the scoping letter have been addressed. Also, since this is one of Valley Center's RCA's (Resource Conservation Areas), we would like to ensure that the biological/environmental issues are adequately addressed. Furthermore, we want to dedicate an easement for the Valley Center community pathway (the pathway is located where the property abuts Old Castle road). Finally, identify current structures on the property and address any issues pertaining to them.

**Maker/Second:** Britsch/Hofler

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 Voice**

**5.f.**

Discussion and possible vote on addition of home telephone numbers of VCCPG members to the projects they present as well as telephone numbers for DPLU Planners and project contacts. (Smith)

**Discussion:** Glavinic suggests importance of access to VCCPG from public. Hutchison suggested including email addresses. Anderson asks about reimbursement for cell minutes if phone numbers are published. Davis suggested the new VCCPG web site may provide enough access to resolve the problem. Smith thinks phone numbers will allow more direct access to the proper person for a particular assigned project. Phone numbers are published as part of election material on file with County.

**Motion: Move we publish planning group members' email addresses on agenda**

**Maker/Second:** Glavinic/Smith

**Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 8-5-0**

A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H	C L O U T I E R	Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W N O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
N	Y	N	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y

**6. Subcommittee Reports & Business: no reports**

- a) Mobility – Robert Davis, Chair.
- b) GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
- c) Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
- d) Northern Village – Ann Quinley, Chair.
- e) Parks & Rec. – Brian Bachman, Chair.
- f) Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive
- g) Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.
- h) Spanish Valley Ranch – Oliver Smith, Chair. - inactive
- i) Tribal Liason – Larry Glavinic Co-Chair; Victoria Cloutier, Co-Chair
- j) Website – Robert Davis, Chair.
- k) Pauma Ranch – Christine Lewis, Co-Chair; LaVonne Norwood-Johnson, Co-Chair.

**7. Correspondence Received:**

a. DPLU to VCCPG; Mackey Site Preparation Administrative Permit SCOPING LETTER; Case Number: 3000 10-056 (AD); Environmental Review NO. 10-08-016; Project Address: Woods Valley and Valley Center Roads; APN 189-094-21,02and 03; KIVA Project: 10-0135072; contact person is Brenda Barnard, Wynn Engineering, Inc; 27315 Valley Center Road. Applicant requests an Administrative Permit to remove 51,779 cubic yards of material for the site. The applicant has opted to remove the material at this time in anticipation of future availability of sewer service to the site. Material removed would be deposited at a

	rock quarry site on the San Pasqual Indian Reservation east of the site. Project was approved by VCCPG on June 28, 2010 and reconfirmed on 12/13/10. (DPLU Planner is Amber Griffith 858-694-2423) (Vick)	
	b .DPLU to VCCPG; AT&T Circles R Lane Wireless Telecommunication Facility Major Use Permit; PROJECT ISSUES CHECKLIST; Case Number: P10-041; Environmental Log No.: ER 10-02-012; Project Address: 30352 Circle R Lane; APN 129-390-19-00; KIVA Project: 10-0135578. Contact person is Karen Adler, PlanCom, 302 State Place, Escondido. Major Use Permit to place a telecommunication facility consisting of a 45-foot tall mono-broad-leaf tree mounted with 12 panel antennas, and a 14-foot tall equipment shelter to house equipment. (DPLU Planner is Michelle Chan 858-694-2510) (Glavinic)	
	c. DPLU to VCCPG; Kim Tentative Parcel Map; INFORMATION FOR FURTHER PROCESSING OF APPLICATION-Case Number: 3200-21183 TPM; 3910-10-02-010 (ER); Project Address: 29670 Pamoosa Lane; APN 185-250-42; KIVA Project 10-0135167. The project is a Tentative Parcel Map application to subdivide a 46.72 acre parcel into 4 parcels plus a designed remainder ranging in area from 7/4 acres to 12.2 acres. Contact persons are Chong K and Sun Yi Kim, 29670 Pamoosa Lane, DPLU Planner is Robert Hingtgen 858-694-3712) (Britsch)	
	d .DPLU to VCCPG; Valley Center View Properties Retail Site Plan; 3500-08-013 (S08-0131) Miller Road Plaza; Miller Road an Valley Center Road; Contact person is Jerry Gaughan 619-846-7705; (DPLU Planner is Kristina Jeffers 958-694-2604) (Quinley) e. DPLU to VCCPG; for distribution to planning group members. Statement of Economic Interest forms (Form 700) Completed forms from each Planning Group member must be received by the California Fair Political Practices Commission 428 J Street, Suite 620, Sacramento, CA 95814 By March 31, 2011.	
	e. DPLU to VCCPG; for distribution to planning group members. Statement of Economic Interest forms (Form 700) Completed forms from each Planning Group member must be received by the California Fair Political Practices Commission 428 J Street, Suite 620, Sacramento, CA 95814 By March 31, 2011.	
	f. DPLU to VCCPG; Valley Center Towing Site Plan; 3500 08-005; project is located at 28425 South Cole Grade Road. Guide to applicant of further processing of application. Project authorizes a towing company. Contact person is Michael Signes, Box 2207, Valley Center. DPLU Planner is Diane Buell 858-694-3721. (Quinley for North Village Subcommittee)	
	g. Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Rudd and Romo to Oliver Smith for VCCPG; appeal from the Valley Center-Pauma Unified School district concerning the Fee to trust request of the San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians directed to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.	
	h. DPLU to VCCPG; Planning Commission's Conditional approval of Tentative Map No. 5315 RPL 6 which proposes the division of property located at Old Castle Road for a density of .05 with a 2 acre minimum lot size. Subdivider is Summit LLC at 3936 Hortensia Street, San Diego, 619-523-0133	
	i. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG; Final Agenda of January 21, 2001 regular meeting at 9:00 AM at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego to consider Medical Marijuana Ordinance Amendments; Beauvais Tentative Map 3100-5315 in Valley Center and AT&T Rice Property Wireless Telecommunication Facility Major use Permit P-9-020 in Valley . Both Valley Center projects were approved.	
	i. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG; Final Agenda of January 21, 2001 regular meeting at 9:00 AM at 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego to consider Medical Marijuana Ordinance Amendments; Beauvais Tentative Map 3100-5315 in Valley Center and AT&T Rice Property Wireless Telecommunication Facility Major use Permit P-9-020 in Valley . Both Valley Center projects were approved.	
	K. DPLU to VCCPG; I-15/395 Master Planned Community Major Pre-Application; Case number 3992-10-025 (MPA); Project Location: Northwestern Corner of Valley Center, Southwest of Lilac Road, East of Old Highway 395. Contact: Accretive Investments, Inc. (Jon Rilling) 12275 El Camino Read, Suite 110, San Diego.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Motion to Adjourn: 9.40pm</b>	
	<b>Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley</b>	
	<b>Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 14-0-0 voice</b>	<b>Next Meeting: 14 March 2011</b>